

A. INTRODUCTION

The Cross Harbor Freight Program (CHFP) aims to engage project stakeholders in an ongoing dialogue regarding project goals, the definition of the project alternatives, and the assessment of environmental effects of these alternatives. An Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Program (ACPIP) is being conducted as part of the project's Tier I Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to inform interested parties of the progress of the project and to encourage continuous agency and community involvement in the decision-making process. To date, the project has conducted outreach tailored specifically to the interested public, residents, elected officials, community groups, freight users and providers, transportation agencies and regulatory agencies. This approach informed and involved these groups at appropriate points in the project lifecycle by presenting timely information and obtaining feedback.

The ACPIP has also included specific steps to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requirements for public scoping, as prescribed in 40 CFR 1501.7 and Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).

The following chapter outlines the overall approach to agency coordination and public involvement undertaken by the project, including a description of various media and meetings that have provided information about the project.

B. AGENCY COORDINATION

SAFETEA-LU SECTION 6002 COORDINATION

Pursuant to Section 6002 of SAFETEA-LU, agencies are responsible for identifying, as early as practical, any issues of concern regarding the project's potential environmental, social, or economic impacts that could substantially delay or prevent an agency from granting a permit or other approval that is needed for the project. Section 6002 is intended to assure that agencies are fully engaged in the scoping of the project and the decisions regarding alternatives to be evaluated in detail in the NEPA analysis. An agency's role in the development of the above project may include the following as they relate to areas of expertise:

1. Provide meaningful and early input to the methodologies and level of detail required in the alternatives analysis and environmental assessment, as referenced above.
2. Identify issues that could substantially delay or prevent granting of permits/approvals.
3. Identify opportunities for collaboration, including participating in coordination meetings and joint field reviews, as appropriate.

4. Provide timely review and comment on preliminary environmental documents to reflect the views and concerns of their respective agencies on the adequacy of the documents, alternatives considered, and anticipated impacts and mitigation.

The agency coordination portion of the project's ACPIP was guided by the project's SAFETEA-LU Coordination Plan (see **Appendix B**). The goal of the plan was to comply with Section 6002 of SAFETEA-LU, which requires an agency coordination plan for those projects for which an EIS is prepared. The plan is meant to foster participation and cooperation among federal, state and local agencies during the environmental review process.

The SAFETEA-LU Plan describes the roles and responsibilities of each agency involved in the project. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA; the lead federal agency) and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PANYNJ; co-lead agency and project sponsor) are intent on promoting the efficient management of the project development process and enhancing opportunities for coordination with the public and with other federal, state and local governments. FHWA, in coordination with PANYNJ, had also identified those federal, state, and local agencies that would be invited to be cooperating agencies or participating agencies for this project. Cooperating agencies have funding, approval and/or permitting authority, while participating agencies may have an interest in the project and/or possess information that would be relevant to the project.

Cooperating and participating agencies are responsible for providing input on the following, to the extent that they can during the Tier I EIS process:

- The project's purpose and need;
- Range of alternatives;
- Methodologies for conducting environmental analyses, including the level of detail required for the analysis of alternatives;
- Identification of issues that could substantially delay or prevent the granting of permits and approvals; and
- Potential mitigation measures.

SAFETEA-LU coordination for this project began in June 2010, concurrently with project scoping. A number of agencies were invited to become cooperating agencies for the project; several additional agencies were invited at a later time, as the project progressed and environmental analyses identified resources within the project's study area that would fall under the jurisdiction of these agencies.

COOPERATING AGENCIES

Table 3-1 below lists the entities that were invited to become a cooperating agency, along with the reason for their requested involvement. Agencies that accepted/declined the invitation are listed in **Appendix B**.

**Table 3-1
Invited as Cooperating Agencies**

Agency Name	Reason for Involvement
Federal Emergency Management Agency (Region 2)	Jurisdiction over floodplains in the study area; potential use of river crossings as a means of emergency access across New York Harbor.
Federal Maritime Administration	Agency's programs promote the use of waterborne transportation and its seamless integration with other segments of the transportation system.
Federal Railroad Administration	Promulgation and enforcement of freight railroad safety regulations.
Federal Transit Administration	Oversight of passenger railroads that may be affected by increased freight rail operations on lines on which they operate.
Surface Transportation Board (STB)	Potential extensions of railway lines that may be part of the national system. Concurrence by STB needed for construction.
Transportation Security Administration	Oversight of the security of freight movement within the United States as well as administering several grant programs concerned with rail and freight security.
U.S. Coast Guard First Coast Guard District	Permitting administration of Section 9 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, related to construction of any bridge, dam, dike, or causeway over or in navigable waters of the United States.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Permitting responsibility under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (discharge of dredged or fill material into navigable waters); Permitting responsibility under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (excavation or fill within navigable waters or building of wharves, piers, jetties, and other structures within navigable waters).
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Expertise in environmental impact assessment including range of alternatives, purpose and need, and secondary and cumulative effects. Regulatory concerns include: Transportation Conformity under the Clean Air Act; Section 404 permitting under the Clean Water Act among others.
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	Consultation under Section 106, National Historic Preservation Act.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Jurisdiction over natural resources in the study area; Section 7, Endangered Species Act.
National Marine Fisheries Service	Jurisdiction over natural resources in the study area; Section 7, Endangered Species Act.
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation	Permitting responsibility under Section 401 Water Quality Certification (consistency with Clean Water Act regulations for work in water bodies); Article 24 freshwater wetlands regulatory program; Article 15 protection of waters regulatory program.
New York State Department of Transportation (Regions 10 and 11)	Potential benefits to service levels and safety on existing and proposed New York State highways.
New York State Office of Parks, Recreation & Historic Preservation	Consultation with State Historic Preservation Office under Section 106, National Historic Preservation Act.
NYS Department of State, Division of Coastal Resources	Consistency with the State's Coastal Zone Management Plan.
New Jersey Department of Transportation	Potential benefits to service levels and safety on existing and proposed New Jersey highways.
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection	Consistency with the State's Coastal Zone Management Plan. Contaminated materials and site remediation and air quality construction and conformity issues. Jurisdiction over wetlands including Waterfront Development Permitting and Flood Hazard.
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (Historic Preservation Office)	Consultation with the NJ Historic Preservation Office under Section 106, National Historic Preservation Act.
Connecticut Department of Transportation	Potential benefits to service levels and safety on existing and proposed roadways.
New York City Department of Design and Construction	Potential construction period impacts.
New York City Department of City Planning	Potential impacts on land use and consistency with New York City's public policies.
New York City Department of Transportation	Potential benefits to service levels and safety on existing and proposed City-owned roadways.
Long Island Regional Planning Council	Potential impacts on land use and consistency with public policies.

Cross Harbor Freight Program

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

Table 3-2 includes the entities that were invited to be involved in the SAFETEA-LU process as a participating agency and the reason for their involvement.

Table 3-2
Invited as Participating Agencies

Agency Name	Reason for Involvement
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Jurisdiction over natural resources in the study area; Section 7, Endangered Species Act.
National Marine Fisheries Service	Consultation regarding proposed alternatives relative to ecological effects on coastal waters including review of the project's Essential Fish Habitat for New York Harbor and its tributaries.
Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA)	Potential effects of proposed alternatives where MTA is planning future transit and commuter rail access and capital projects.
Metropolitan Transportation Authority-Bridges and Tunnels	Relationship of project alternatives to MTA – B & T properties and direct and indirect (traffic) effects on these facilities.
Metropolitan Transportation Authority-Long Island Rail Road	Potential effects of proposed alternatives on LIRR operations, facilities and/or future plans.
Metropolitan Transportation Authority-Metro-North Railroad	Potential effects of proposed alternatives on MNR operations, facilities and/or future plans.
Metropolitan Transportation Authority-New York City Transit	Potential effects of proposed alternatives on NYCT operations (bus and subway), facilities and/or future plans.
New Jersey Transit	Potential effects of proposed alternatives on New Jersey Transit operations, facilities and/or future plans.
NYS Office of Parks, Recreation & Historic Preservation	Coordinating effects determination for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation	Predicted diversion of freight movement by truck to rail or waterborne modes, and potential benefits to service levels and safety on existing and proposed Pennsylvania highways.
South Western Regional Planning Agency	Forum for interagency cooperation and public input into public project funding decisions.
Connecticut Department of Transportation	Predicted diversion of freight movement by truck to rail or waterborne modes, and potential benefits to service levels and safety on existing and proposed Connecticut highways.
Economic Development Corporation of Essex County	Project alternatives may impact long-range planning proposals for economic development in the county.
Essex County Department of Public Works (DPW)	Project alternatives may impact facilities or future plans/projects under DPW jurisdiction.
Hudson County Economic Development Corporation	Project alternatives may impact long-range planning proposals for economic development in the county.
City of Jersey City	Project alternatives may impact long-range planning proposals for economic development in the city.
North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority	Collaborative planning forum to address transportation-related issues from a regional prospective and decide on allocation of federal transportation funds.
New York Metropolitan Transportation Council	Collaborative planning forum to address transportation-related issues from a regional prospective and decide on allocation of federal transportation funds.
New York City Department of Environmental Protection	Potential site remediation and contaminated materials disturbance, noise regulations, and local air quality issues.
New York City Economic Development Corporation	Consistency with PlaNYC and other economic goals of New York City.
New York City Fire Department	Coordination of emergency services during construction and operation of the project alternatives.
New York City Police Department	Coordination of emergency services during construction and operation of the project alternatives.
New York City Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination	Coordination of emergency services during construction and operation of the project alternatives.

Table 3-2 (cont'd)
Invited as Participating Agencies

Agency Name	Reason for Involvement
NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission	Coordinating potential effects to cultural resources.
Union County Department of Engineering and Public Works	Project alternatives may impact facilities under DPW jurisdiction.
Union County Improvement Authority	Project alternatives may impact long-range planning proposals for economic development in the county.
Hudson County Division of Planning	Potential project impacts on land use and consistency with public policies.
Hudson County Engineering	Potential construction period impacts.
New York City Department of Design and Construction	Potential construction period impacts.
Jersey City Department of Public Works	Potential construction period impacts.
Jersey City Department of Housing, Economic Development and Commerce	Potential economic impacts from the operation of the project and consistency with public policies.

Both cooperating and participating agencies have been afforded a number of opportunities to provide input into the project process, in accordance with the input points identified above. **Table 3-3** summarizes project milestones and coordination points to date and projects a schedule for additional coordination beyond this Tier I Draft EIS (DEIS).

Table 3-3
Project Milestones and Coordination Points

Coordination Item	Date completed/anticipated	FHWA/PANYNJ Role	Cooperating/Participating Agency Role
Notice of Intent	May 13, 2010	Publish revised Notice of Intent to prepare Tier I EIS	None.
SAFETEA-LU Coordination Plan - Draft	Ongoing Agency comments on SAFETEA-LU plan due by July 30, 2010	Compose Coordination Plan – Draft. Provide ongoing revisions of the plan if required.	Review Plan and Agree on Role.
NEPA Scoping	October 2010	Draft Scoping Document and EIS Methodology including goals and objectives. Review Needs Assessment Provide response to agency comments and Final Scoping Document.	Provide comments on alternatives considered, proposed methodology and goals and objectives.
Purpose and Need	Meeting on June 30, 2010	Present project introduction, Purpose and Need, and goals and objectives.	Provide comments on project's Purpose and Need and goals and objectives.
Methodology for conducting environmental analyses	Meeting on June 30, 2010	Present Methodology.	Review EIS Methodology report and provide comments.
List of Alternatives	Meeting on May 17, 2011	Describe alternatives to be evaluated in the Tier I EIS.	Provide comments on list of alternatives.
Alternatives Screening	Meeting on October 26, 2011	Present preliminary results of transportation and economic assessment.	Provide comments on preliminary analysis results.
DEIS	November 2014	Publish DEIS Respond to agency comments.	Provide comments on the DEIS.
FEIS	Spring 2015	Identify preferred mode(s) Publish FEIS.	Provide comments on FEIS.

SAFETEA-LU AGENCY MEETINGS

Regular meetings have been conducted between the PANYNJ, FHWA, and the SAFETEA-LU agencies to inform the agencies about the project progress, to solicit technical feedback, and to gather input that may help anticipate any issues with regulatory approvals during the project implementation.

June 30, 2010 – New York Metropolitan Transportation Council – New York, NY

The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the purpose and need, methodologies, alternatives, SAFETEA-LU coordination, and project schedule. Agencies were reminded to respond to the SAFETEA-LU invitation. Agencies were asked to provide comments, in writing, on or before July 30, 2013, for the SAFETEA-LU Coordination Plan, the Notice of Intent, and the draft Needs Assessment documents that were distributed in advance of the meeting. Thirty-six (36) individuals from various agencies attended the meeting.

May 17, 2011 – PANYNJ – New York, NY

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update on the project including feedback from recent scoping meeting held in the region as well as presenting the finalized SAFETEA-LU plan and share preliminary screening analysis outcomes. Twenty-three (23) individuals from various agencies attended the meeting. The presentation document was sent to all SAFETEA-LU agencies as a follow-up item.

October 26, 2011 – New York Metropolitan Transportation Council – New York, NY

The purpose of this meeting was to present and discuss preliminary demand modeling results and include an update on the project. Twenty-one (21) individuals from various agencies attended the meeting. The presentation document was sent to all SAFETEA-LU agencies as a follow-up item.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

A TAC, comprising representatives from various agencies, transportation industries, environmental organizations, community organizations, elected officials and city planning offices, provides guidance and structured review of technical material during the environmental review and public participation processes. Regular meetings have been conducted between the PANYNJ, FHWA, and the TAC. To date, the TAC has advised on technical subjects such as demand forecasting and transportation models; the alternative modes, alignments, and termini that will be analyzed in the EIS; and potential adverse effects and associated potential mitigation measures. A full list of TAC agencies can be found in **Appendix B**.

September 30, 2009 – New York Metropolitan Transportation Council – New York, NY

The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the project, discuss the challenges in freight movement, and review the role of the TAC Committee. 17 individuals from various agencies attended the meeting.

December 17, 2009 – North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority – Newark, NJ

The purpose of this workshop meeting was to present an opportunity for TAC members to learn about the proposed modeling methodologies; express their ideas and views to the Project Team,

and highlight specific issues to address during the modeling effort. The objective of the Workshop was to provide the Cross Harbor Project Team with valuable feedback and guidance from freight rail and technical experts on proposed methodologies.

March 24, 2010 – North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority – Newark, NJ

The purpose of this workshop meeting was to focus on a range of feasible project alternatives to be evaluated in a first-level screening. Forty-two (42) individuals from various agencies attended the meeting.

June 28, 2011 – PANYNJ – New York, NY

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update on the project including feedback from scoping meeting held in the region along with preliminary results from the screening analysis. Thirty-three (33) individuals from various agencies attended the meeting.

January 26, 2012 – North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority – Newark, NJ

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update on project progress. Twenty-one (21) individuals from various agencies attended the meeting.

January 31, 2012 – New York Metropolitan Transportation Council – New York, NY

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update on project progress. Seventeen (17) individuals from various agencies attended the meeting.

STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SAC)

A SAC was also formed for the CHFP. Whereas members of the TAC have specific technical expertise in relation to the project, SAC members have a general interest in the project and can offer insights regarding its effect on business operations, the environment, historical structures, or their constituents. SAC members include elected officials and community organizations, in addition to freight industry representatives, transportation professionals, and other interested parties within the study area and/or affected communities. Members provide feedback on project information and participate in the public process. A full list of SAC agencies can be found in **Appendix B**. Regular meetings have been conducted between the PANYNJ, FHWA and SAC.

September 30, 2009 – New York Metropolitan Transportation Council – New York, NY

The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the project, discuss the challenges in freight movement, and review the role of the SAC Committee. Twenty-seven (27) individuals from various agencies attended the meeting.

March 24, 2010 – North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority – Newark, NJ

The purpose of this workshop meeting was to welcome input into the ongoing development of project goals, project alternatives, and our proposed screening methodology. Twenty-one (21) individuals from various agencies attended the meeting.

January 26, 2012 – North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority – Newark, NJ

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update on project progress. Nineteen (19) individuals from various agencies attended the meeting.

January 31, 2012 – New York Metropolitan Transportation Council – New York, NY

The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update on project progress. Thirty-two (32) individuals from various agencies attended the meeting.

C. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The public involvement portion of the project's ACPIP was guided by a Public Involvement Plan (see **Appendix B**), the key goal of which was to inform interested parties about the project and seek input on a wide range of issues. Specific objectives of the plan included:

- Providing New York and New Jersey elected officials, agencies, community boards, town, city and borough councils, special interest groups, residents, businesses, and property owners with necessary information and an opportunity to become actively involved in the development of the EIS;
- Identifying potential issues that could be addressed before the issuance of the DEIS and resolved before the document is completed;
- Building public credibility by becoming the primary source and point of contact for information;
- Soliciting community feedback on the scope of alternatives, environmental and community issues to be covered, and the methods for their evaluation;
- Balancing points of view among regional/local interests and environmental/commercial interests to arrive at a consensus on a set of Preferred Alternatives;
- Soliciting formal comments on the EIS; and
- Complying with relevant laws and regulations.

The public involvement methodology was tailored specifically to targeted groups to provide the most useful information to each group and to collect the most valuable feedback:

- Scoping Meetings for formal public comments on EIS methodology and findings; and
- Outreach to affected groups and communities, such as local and regional elected officials, community boards, community groups, and special interest groups such as the shipping industry.

Forums and venues for meetings were selected so that constituents could easily participate in the process.

COMMUNICATION MEDIA

The CHFP Public Involvement Plan encompassed a variety of communication vehicles such as:

- **A Needs Assessment** – The Needs Assessment provides a historic background on the project, summarized previous efforts, and illustrated the need for the project. The Needs Assessment can be found at <http://www.crossharborstudy.com> and in **Appendix B**.
- **Newsletters** – Project newsletters were developed and served as an educational tool and provided information about the study during key stages. Newsletters were generally four-pages and available in both English and Spanish for printed distribution at meetings and as well as available as a .pdf on the project website.

- **E-Communications** – E-communications consisted of various electronic means of communication including e-blasts sent to CHFP Stakeholders including members of TAC, SAC, and SAFTEA-LU in advance of all meetings, including all committee meetings and Public Scoping Meetings. Other e-communications included a Project Bulletin, which served as a mini-briefing for Community Boards and other interested groups and organizations. The Project Bulletin was formatted as a one-sided, single-page .pdf to also serve as print-on-demand publications.
- **Website** – The project’s website, <http://www.crossharborstudy.com>, contains project information, published documents, public meeting notes, and contact information. The website also served to keep the public notified about upcoming public meetings. It is the primary resource for public information about the project, as well as the primary means for the public to contact the project team.
- **Social Media** – The project utilized social media for the internal purpose of monitoring CHFP news on the Internet as well as sharing real-time information about meetings and activities.
- **Meetings** – Informational meetings were held to facilitate a better understanding of CHFP and to encourage feedback on the study. Meetings were advertised with local media outlets and/or publicized via a media advisory/public service announcement.

PUBLIC SCOPING

Following the release in September 2010 of the Draft Scoping Document, Draft Environmental Methodology, and Needs Assessment (see **Appendix B**), a series of six public scoping meetings were announced and held in New York and New Jersey (see **Table 3-3**).

Table 3-3
Public Scoping Meetings

	Date	Location	Number of Attendees
Bronx, NY	October 5, 2010	Bronx Borough Hall - NY	6
Brooklyn, NY	October 12, 2010	Brooklyn Borough Hall - NY	17
Queens, NY	October 13, 2010	Queens Borough Hall – NY	16
Jersey City, NJ	October 7, 2010	Jersey City Hall, NJ	13
NJTPA, NJ	October 7, 2010	North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, Newark, NJ	11
Long Island, NY	May 5, 2011	Marriott Courtyard – Farmingdale, NY	29

The meetings were advertised in local publications (listed in **Table 3-4**) appropriate to each meeting location.

In addition to paid legal notices, media advisories were sent to the outlets listed in **Table 3-5** in advance of the Scoping Information Sessions.

The purpose of the scoping meetings was to discuss the Draft Scoping Document and DEIS Methodology and to accept comments from the public. Attendees viewed a short presentation by a representative from PANYNJ on the project’s purpose and need, potential project alternatives, the EIS process, and the project schedule. Attendees were then given an opportunity to view presentation materials and boards, ask questions of the project team, and to provide formal oral or written comments to be entered into the project record.

Table 3-4
Public Scoping Meetings Ads

Target Area	Publication Name/Type
Hudson County, NJ	The Star-Ledger / Newspaper
	Jersey Journal / Newspaper
New York, general	New York Daily News / Newspaper
Queens, NY	Ledger / Newspaper
	Chronicle / Newspaper
Brooklyn, NY	Courier Publications / Newspaper
Bronx	Bronx Times / Newspaper
NY	El Diario / Newspaper (TBC)
NJ	Cambio / Newspaper (TBC)
Long Island, NY	Suffolk Times / Newspaper
	Newsday / Newspaper

Table 3-5
Media Advisories

Target Area	Publication Name/Type
Long Island, NY	Times Review / Newspaper
	Long Island Press / Newspaper
	Patch.com / Web
	Herald Community Newspapers / Newspapers
	Farmingdale Observer / Newspaper
	Long Island Advance / Newspaper
	Long Island Herald / Newspaper
	The Leader Online / Web
	The Leader / Newspaper
	Anton News / Newspaper
	The Babylon Beacon / Newspaper
	RCN / TV
	New York Metropolitan Transportation Council
New York/New Jersey	WCBS-AM / Radio
New York/New Jersey	WINS-AM / Radio
Jersey City, NJ	WFMU-FM / Radio
New Jersey	News 12 NJ / TV
New York	News 12 NY / TV
	NY1 / TV

Following a 60-day public comment period, all oral and written comments received were compiled into a Scoping Comments Summary (see **Appendix B**) and made available on the project website. Approximately 107 comments were received throughout the scoping process.

TARGETED PUBLIC OUTREACH

In addition to the formal scoping and advisory committee meetings, the CHFP Public Involvement Plan includes pro-active outreach efforts designed to educate and inform community organizations and select local officials, and to address concerns while the project was still in the planning stages. Outreach efforts have included:

Chapter 3: Agency Coordination and Public Involvement

- Scheduled meetings with New York City Community Boards to present the CHFP either during formal meetings, transportation committee meetings, or informal informational sessions;
- One-on-one outreach to select local officials to inform them about the project and anticipate their concerns about how CHFP would affect their constituents;
- Official briefings for elected officials prior to SAC meetings; and
- Meetings with other key stakeholders in the region including those from railroad, shipping and related industries; community groups; federal, state, county, regional, and city elected and appointed officials as necessary.

Meetings were coordinated by various members of the outreach team. A record of all outreach activity was maintained in the outreach meeting log and is summarized in **Table 3-6**. All meetings considered the accessibility needs and Spanish-language translation requirements of its attendees.

Table 3-6
Ongoing Public Involvement Meetings to Date

Date	Organization/Meeting Description
14-Sep-2010	United Puerto Rican Organization of Sunset Park
24-Sep-2010	Environmental Defense Fund
17-Sep-2010	Regional Plan Association
24-Sep-2010	Tri-State Transportation Campaign
30-Sep-2010	Long Island Association
16-Sep-2010	New Jersey Sierra Club
28-Sep-2010	Sustainable South Bronx
26-Oct-2010	CURES (Civics United for Railroad Environmental Solutions) & Community Board 5 Queens Transportation Committee
27-Oct-2010	Queens Community Board 5 Transportation Committee Meeting
15-Nov-2010	Assemblywoman Margaret Markey
22-Nov-2010	U.S. Representative Joseph Crowley (7th Congressional District - Bronx, Queens)
30-Nov-2010	Vision Long Island (VLI)
14-Dec-2010	Senator Joseph P. Addabbo
28-Jan-2011	Council Member Elizabeth Crowley
17-Feb-2011	Assembly Member Michael Miller
17-Feb-2011	Assembly Member Margaret Markey
22-Feb-2011	Michael Gluck (via phone), Representative Anthony Weiner's Office
24-Feb-2011	Assembly Member Andrew Hevesi
2-Mar-2011	NYCDOT Maspeth Bypass Meeting
24-Mar-2011	New York and Atlantic in Jamaica
4-May-2011	Partnership for New York City (the Partnership)
5-May-2011	Council Member Brad Lander
17-May-2011	Queen Community Board 2, Transportation Committee
9-Jun-2011	Maspeth Bus Tour: Commencing at Assembly Member Margaret Markey Office
19-August-2011	Lydon Sleeper (via phone), Council Member Elizabeth Crowley's Office
12-Sept-2011	Brooklyn Community Board 10
04-Oct-2011	Brooklyn Borough Board
11-Oct-2011	Brooklyn Community Board 14
3-Nov-2011	Jessica Clemente, We Stay/Nos Quedamos, Inc.
3-Nov-2011	James Tripp, Environmental Defense Fund
3-Nov-2011	Veronica Vanterpool, Tri-State Transportation Campaign
11-Dec-2011	Brooklyn Community Board 17
11-Apr-2012	Congressman Joseph Crowley
23-Apr-2012	CURES (Civics United for Railroad Environmental Solutions)
16-Oct-2012	Long Island Rail Road (LIRR)

Databases—tracking information on all project stakeholders, including elected officials, community groups, local businesses, public agencies, affiliated team members, project committee members, and other interested parties—were maintained and regularly updated throughout the duration of the project. The databases were also used to document correspondence and feedback received throughout the EIS process. Databases were updated and reviewed after every meeting to ensure accuracy.

D. PUBLIC REVIEW/COMMENT ON DEIS

After the publication of this Tier I DEIS, public hearings will be held to solicit and record comments. Prior to the hearings, the DEIS will be made available on the project's website; hard copies of the DEIS will also be placed in selected repositories, such as public libraries in New York and New Jersey.

At the DEIS public hearings, formal testimony will be recorded electronically by a stenographer and incorporated into a comments summary. Comments outside of formal testimony may also be submitted immediately at the hearings in written format. Comments will also be accepted during the comment period via e-mail, mail, or the project website. The public comment period will be open for more than 45 days after the publication of the DEIS, and will end in February 2015. *